



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	5301		
Country/Region:	Regional (Kyrgyz Republic, Kazakhstan, Tajikistan)		
Project Title:	Enabling Country of the Transboundary Syr Darya Basin to Make Sustainable Use of their Ground Water Potential and Subsurface Space with Consideration to Climate Variability and Change		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4984 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	International Waters
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	IW-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$3,500,000
Co-financing:	\$17,500,000	Total Project Cost:	\$21,100,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Christian Severin	Agency Contact Person:	Vladimir mamaev

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible ?	28th of February 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the three countries are eligible.	
Eligibility	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	28th of February 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the operational focal points have endorsed the project proposal	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
Resource Availability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the STAR allocation? 		
Resource Availability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the focal area allocation? 	28th of February 2013 (cseverin): Yes the funds are available under the IW focal area.	
Resource Availability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 		

	Technology Transfer)?		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 		
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</p> <p><i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	28th of February 2013 (cseverin): Yes this is fully aligned with the IW Objective 3 and its results framework.	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	28th of February 2013 (cseverin): Yes this suggested project and its activities are aligned with the national priorities. Please do through the project preparation phase work towards receiving endorsement of this project by the last country in the basin, namely Uzbekistan. It will be essential for the sustainability and relevance for development and implementation of a strong TDA and future sustainable use of transboundary water resources.	
	<p>6. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	28th of February 2013 (cseverin): Yes the baseline projects are aligned with the issues that the project will be targetting.	

	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	3rd of March 2013 (cseverin): yes the project framework is including sufficiently clear outcomes and outputs. Please at time of endorsement provide more easily quantifiable output indicators as well as please do make sure to include wording that supports output 5.1 at an appropriate place in the text.	
	8. Are global environmental benefits adequately identified, and the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	3rd of March 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the PIF identifies IW GEBs.	
	9. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits , including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?		
	10. Is public participation , including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	3rd of March 2013 (cseverin): Yes the public participation is described and stakeholder groups identified.	
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks , including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	3rd of March 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the PIF includes a matrix outlining the identified Risk along with mitigation measure.	
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	3rd of March 2013 (cseverin): Yes the proposal will be fully aligned with other ongoing initiatives in the region.	
	13. Comment on the project's	3rd of March 2013 (cseverin): This	

	<p>sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. - Assess the project's sustainability strategy and the likelihood project outcomes will be sustained or not based on the evidence in the literature. - Are there measures to secure the institutional and financial stability of the project? - Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention strategy and critique the plan for scaling up. 	<p>approach as it will be rolling conjunctive management of the groundwater and surface freshwater resources in a region that has generally been managing their water resources through approaches more strictly defined by the water body type. At the same time the project will be facilitating this approach in a transboundary context, this is adding to the project complexity, but also to the potential gains when the project will be successful.</p> <p>By investing in the development of a TDA/SAP for the Syr Darya Basin and its conjunctive management of the shared water resources, it will effect that the countries will be able to tackle transboundary water management issues, which potentially will lead to implementation of the SAP.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		
	<p>15. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?</p>		
<p>Project Financing</p>	<p>16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing per component appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p>	<p>3rd of March 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the suggested distribution of the financing to the identified components seems to be appropriate.</p> <p>However, please do at time of CEO Endorsement insert into component 5.1 output description, that 1% of the GEF grant will be going towards the identified</p>	

	17. At PIF: Is the amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role? Any comment on the indicated amount and composition of cofinancing ? At CEO endorsement: Has cofinancing been confirmed?	3rd of March 2013 (cseverin): Yes, it is considered to be in line and actually on the higher side, compared to what is the norm for IW UNDP projects.	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	3rd of March 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the PM budget is inline with the GEF SEC guidance.	
	19. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	3rd of March 2013 (cseverin): NA	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	20. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	21. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	22. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	23. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	3rd of March 2013 (cseverin): Yes, PIF clearance is recommended,	
	24. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	25. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested and approved? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status	3rd of March 2013 (cseverin): Yes, PPG is requested and is recommended for approval.	

	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**